UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,730	08/21/2000	Yoshiko Shiimori	5-006US-FF	8090

21254	7590	06/10/2005

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/641,730	SHIIMORI, YOSHIKO
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benjamin R. Bruckart	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 December 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-30_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-29_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _30_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-30 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 22-30 are new.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection is withdrawn in light of applicant's

amendment.

Change of Address

The change of address received on 12/27/04 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment filed 12/17/05, have been fully considered

but they are not persuasive. The reasons are set forth below.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 30 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis

for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4-10, 12, 16-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No 6, 675,357 by Carter et al

Regarding claim 1, a data communication system (Carter: col. 2, line 16) comprising:
a client computer and a server that are capable of communicating data with each other (Carter: col. 3, lines 10-26),
wherein said client computer includes a first font transmitting unit (Carter: col. 4, line 47) for transmitting font information data representing fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-13); and
wherein said server includes:
a first receiving unit for receiving the font information data that has been transmitted from said first font transmitting unit of said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-23);
a font search unit for searching for fonts, which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer, from among fonts capable of being output at said server, on the basis of fonts represented by the font information data that has been received by said first receiving unit (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 12-18, 57-61); and
a second font transmitting unit (Carter: col. 4, line 10-14) for transmitting font information data representing the fonts, which have been found by said font search unit, to said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 16; col. 5, lines 35-48).

Regarding claim 4, the system according to claim 1, wherein said client computer further includes:
a selection unit for selecting a type of document to be created (Carter: col. 5, lines 60-67; client request); and
a selection-data transmitting unit for transmitting selection data, which represents the type of document selected by said selection unit, to said server (Carter: col. 5, lines 53-61; col. 6, lines 4-16); and
said server further includes a selection-data receiving unit for receiving the document selection data that has been transmitted from said client computer (Carter: col. 5, lines 53-61);
said font search unit searching for fonts, which are capable of being output at said client computer, on the basis of the type of document represented by the selection data that has been received by said selection data receiving unit and the font information data that has been received by said first receiving unit (Carter: col. 5, lines 40-53; col. 7, lines 12-18).

Regarding claim 5, the system according to claim 4, wherein said server further includes a second reporting unit for reporting fonts, which are capable of being output, in association with the type of document (Carter: col. 7, lines 16; col. 5, lines 35-48).

Regarding claim 10, the system according to claim 1, wherein said client computer further comprises a font name display device that displays a font name represented by the font information data transmitted from said second font transmitting unit of said server (Carter: col. 4, lines 50-52; Figure 1; Figure 3; col. 5, lines 35-42).

Regarding claim 16, the system according to claim 1,
further comprising a printer attached to said server (Carter: col. 3, lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 17, the system according to claim 16, wherein said font information data, including fonts capable of being output from said server and capable of being output at said client computer, comprises fonts capable of being printed by said printer (Carter: col. 5, lines 56- col. 6, line 18; col. 7, lines 10-23).

Regarding claim 6, a client computer capable of communicating data with a server, (Carter: col. 3, lines 10-26) wherein:

font information data representing fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer are transmitted from said client computer to said server (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-13); and

said server searches fonts capable of being output at said server for fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer based upon fonts represented by the font information data that has been transmitted from said client computer, and transmits font information data representing the fonts that have been found to said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-23; col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 12-18, 57-61);

said client computer having:

a receiving unit for receiving font information data that has been transmitted from said server (Carter: col. 4, line 47); and

a reporting unit for reporting fonts represented by the font information data that has been received by said receiving unit (Carter: col. 7, lines 16; col. 5, lines 35-48).

Regarding claim 7, a server capable of communicating data with a client computer (Carter: col. 3, lines 10-26), comprising:

a receiving unit for receiving font information data transmitted from said client computer and representing fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-23; col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 12-18, 57-61);

a search unit for searching for fonts, which are capable of being output at said client computer, from among fonts capable of being output at said server, on the basis of fonts represented by the font information data that has been received by said first receiving unit (Carter: col. 5, lines 40-53; col. 7, lines 12-18); and

a transmitting unit for transmitting font information data, which represents fonts that have been found by said search unit, to said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-13).

Regarding claim 8, a method of controlling a server which communicates data with a client computer (Carter: col. 3, lines 10-26), comprising the steps of:

receiving font information data that has been transmitted from the client computer and that represents fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-23);

searching for fonts, which are which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at the client computer, from among fonts capable of being output at the server, on the basis of fonts represented by the font information data that has been received (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 12-18, 57-61); and

transmitting font information data representing the fonts that have been found to the client computer (Carter: col. 4, line 10-14; col. 7, lines 16; col. 5, lines 35-48).

Regarding claim 9, a computer-readable recording medium storing a program for controlling a client computer capable of communicating with a server (Carter: col. 3, lines 10-26, 55-67), wherein the client computer transmits font information data representing fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer to the server (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-13), said server searches fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said server for fonts capable of being output at said client computer based upon fonts represented by the font information data that has been transmitted from said client computer (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 12-18, 57-61), and transmits font information data representing the fonts that have been found to said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 16; col. 5, lines 35-48);

said program controlling the client computer so as to:

receive font information data that has been transmitted from said server (Carter: col. 4, line 47); and

report fonts represented by the font information data that has been received (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-42; GUI).

Regarding claim 12, a data communications system (Carter: col. 2, lines 16) comprising:

means for communicating data between a client computer and a server (Carter: col. 3, lines 10-26),

wherein said client computer comprises means for transmitting font information data (Carter: col. 4, line 47) including fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-13); and

wherein said server comprises:

means for receiving the font information data transmitted from said means for transmitting (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-23; col. 4, line 10-14);

means for searching for fonts, which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer, from among fonts capable of being output at said server, on the basis of the font information data received by said means for receiving (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 12-18, 57-61); and

second means for transmitting font information data, including the fonts that have been identified by said means for searching, to said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 16; col. 5, lines 35-48).

Regarding claim 18, a data communications server (Carter: col. 2, lines 16) comprising:

a client computer (Carter: col. 3, lines 12-16); and

a server in communication with said client computer (Carter: col. 3, lines 10-16);

wherein said client computer comprises:

a first font transmitting unit that transmits a first font information data (Carter: col. 4, line 47), including fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer to said first server (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-13); and

a first receiving unit that receives a second font information data from said server (Carter: col. 4, line 47; col. 7, lines 16; col. 5, lines 35-48); and

wherein said server comprises:

a second receiving unit for receiving the first font information data transmitted from said first font transmitting unit of said client computer (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-13); and

a second font transmitting unit that transmits the second font information data from said server to said client computer (Carter: col. 4, line 10-14; col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 12-18, 57-61); and

means for ensuring that a font which are stored on said client computer and employed by the client computer is capable of being output by the server (Carter: col. 7, lines 16; col. 5, lines 35-48).

Regarding claim 19, the system according to claim 18, wherein said means for ensuring comprises:

a font search unit that searches for fonts capable of being output at said client computer and capable of being output at said server, based on the first font information data received from said client computer by said first receiving unit, and generates said second font information data comprising fonts capable of being output at said client computer and capable of being output at said server (Carter: col. 5, lines 40- col. 6, lines 15; col. 7, lines 12-18).

Regarding claim 20, the system according to claim 19,

further comprising a printer attached to said server, said printer capable of printing fonts output from said server (Carter: col. 3, lines 24-28).

Regarding claim 21, the system according to claim 19, wherein said font information data, including fonts capable of being output from said server and capable of being output at said client computer, comprises fonts capable of being printed by a printer of the server (Carter: col. 5, lines 40- col. 6, lines 15).

Regarding claim 22, the system according to claim 1, wherein said font information data representing said fonts which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer, comprises:

a list of names of said fonts which are stored on said client computer and which are capable of being output at said client computer (Carter: Figure 5A).

Regarding claim 23, the system according to claim 1, wherein said font information data representing the fonts, which have been found by said font search unit, comprises:

a list of names of said fonts which are stored on said client computer and which are capable of being output at said client computer, which match names of fonts which have been found by said font search unit to be capable of being output at said server (Carter: Figure 5A).

Regarding claim 24, the system according to claim 1, wherein said font search unit compares said fonts, which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer, with said fonts, which are capable of being output at said server (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 8-25).

Regarding claim 25, the system according to claim 24, wherein said font search unit matches at least one of said fonts, which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer, with a font of said fonts, which are capable of being output at said server (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 8-25).

Regarding claim 26, the system according to claim 24, wherein said font search unit selectively determines which fonts of said fonts, which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer, are capable of being output at said server (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 8-25).

Regarding claim 27, the system according to claim 1, wherein said font search unit compares and contrasts said fonts, which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer, with said fonts, which are capable of being output at said server, and

wherein said font search unit identifies said fonts, which are stored on said client computer and capable of being output at said client computer, which are capable of being output at said server.

Regarding claim 28, the system according to claim 1, wherein said font information data representing the fonts, which have been found by said font search unit, comprises:

a list of names of said fonts (Carter: Fig 5A), which are stored on said client computer and which are capable of being output said client computer, and which match names of said fonts which are capable of being output at said server (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 8-25), and

wherein said font search unit generates said list of names of said fonts (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 8-25).

Regarding claim 29, the system according to claim 28, wherein said font search unit generates said list of names of said fonts based on at least one of an operating system of said client computer, a service selected by said client computer, and client information of said client computer (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 8-25; device or system).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-3, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No 6, 675,357 by Carter et al in view of U.S. Patent 5,533,174 by Flowers et al.

Regarding claim 2,

The Carter reference teaches the system according to claim 1 with a client and server in communication with each other with

a font search unit searching for fonts, which are capable of being output at said client computer, on the basis of the data that has been received and the fonts represented by the font information data that has been received by said first receiving unit (Carter: col. 5, lines 50-52).

The Carter reference does not explicitly state sending operating-system data to search by.

The Flowers reference teaches a client computer further includes an operating-system transmitting unit for transmitting operating-system data, which represents an operating system of said client computer, to said server (Flowers: col. 2, lines 52-61; col. 4, lines 50-55); and

said server further includes an operating-system data receiving unit for receiving the operating-system data transmitted from said operating-system data transmitting unit of said client computer (Flowers: col. 4, lines 28-36; col. 4, lines 50-55)

a font search unit searching for fonts, on the basis of the operating system represented by the operating-system data that has been received by said operating-system data receiving unit (Flowers: col. 4, lines 50-67; col. 9, lines 41-52).

The Flowers reference further teaches it communicates with both network workstations and printers, and manages entirely the access to and the manipulation of the fonts to produce the maps and outlines in accordance with system compatibilities and formats (Flowers: col. 2, lines 43-48).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of a client and server in communication as taught by Carter while sending operating system data as taught by Flowers in order to allow access and manipulation as well as compatibility to workstations and printer (Flowers: col. 2, lines 43-48).

Claims 3, 14-15 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Flowers et al and Carter et al.

Regarding claim 3, the system according to claim 2, wherein said server further includes a first reporting unit for reporting fonts, which are capable of being output, in association with an operating system (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-42; col. 7, lines 12-17).

Regarding claim 14, the system of claim 1, wherein a storage capacity of the server is larger than that of a storage capacity of the client computer (Flowers: col. 4, lines 22-27).

Regarding claim 15, the system according to claim 2, wherein said operating-system data comprises a type of document being created by the client computer (Flowers: col. 4, lines 50-55; col. 5, lines 6-16).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,675,357 by Carter et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,650 by Cedar et al.

Regarding claim 11,

The Carter teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein said client and server are in communication.

The Carter reference does not explicitly state a font determination unit on the client.

The Cedar reference teaches a font determination unit that determines a font used in the edited image from among the font information data transmitted from said second font transmitting unit of said server (Cedar: col. 5, lines 29-36); and

image editing means for editing an image using a font determined by said font determination unit (Cedar: col. 5, lines 11-27).

The Cedar reference further teaches the invention adjusts the size of the editable text so that it is aesthetically acceptable and carries out such adjustment without the need for manual input for text editing (Cedar: col. 4, lines 49-58).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of a client and server in communication as taught by Carter while sending operating system data as taught by Cedar in order to allow automated copyfitting that is capable of fitting editable text into a text frame so that it is aesthetically acceptable and carries out adjustments without manual input for editing (Cedar: col. 4, lines 49-58).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,675,357 by Carter et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,692 by Yacoub.

Regarding claim 13,

The Carter reference teaches the system according to claim 1, a printer and client connected to a server in communication with each other.

The Carter reference does not explicitly state the printing quality of the server is greater than that of a printing quality of the client computer.

The Yacoub reference teaches a networked printer server (Yacoub: col. 2, lines 26-29) that searches out the highest quality printer that meets the print job (Yacoub: col. 5, lines 9-16)

The Yacoub reference further teaches the system that processes the print jobs reduces the level of user interaction and increases effectiveness of printing (Yacoub: col. 1, lines 13-20, lines 37-43)

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create a printer and client system network system as taught by Carter while the server is coupled to higher quality printers as taught by Yacoub in order to increase effectiveness higher quality jobs (Yacoub: col. 1, lines 13-20, lines 37-43).

REMARKS

The examiner has read and understands all of applicant's arguments and remarks. The examiner has updated citations to better show the prior art teaches and the interpretations.

The Applicant Argues:

Applicant traverses the rejection on claims 1, 6-9, 12, and 18; arguing the Carter reference does not teach the claimed limitations.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Carter reference does teach the cited limitation. The first font transmitting unit (Carter: col. 4, line 47) is taught as the clients and devices that send font information data to the server. The clients send font information data representing fonts stored at the client computer are the device or system fonts associated with the client (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-13). The server receives the font information data (Carter: col. 7, lines 10-23) and searches for fonts capable of being output at the server from the font information data received from the client by matching logical fonts to device and system fonts (Carter: col. 5, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 12-18, 57-61).

The system and device fonts are the fonts capable of being output by at the client. The logical fonts are the fonts capable of being output at the server. The server queries and matches these fonts and provides indication of the match in the GUI to the client. The second font transmitting unit (Carter: col. 4, line 10-14) sends font information data representing fonts which have been found by said font search unit to the client (Carter: col. 7, lines 16; col. 5, lines 35-48) by displaying the found fonts in the GUI. The GUI allows for modification and configuration of the font properties file on the server by a client (Carter: col. 5, lines 20-45). A font transmitting unit is boiled down to a network connection to transmit data. Both the clients and devices exchange font information data with the server. The vagueness of the "font information data" allows the prior art to read openly on the claim limitation. The examiner encourages applicant to detail with regards to how the font information sent to the client is used. This would distinguish the prior art from the instant application.

Applicant argues the invention enables the user of the client computer to use only those fonts that are capable of being printed by the server when creating documents to be transmitted to the server for printing. This is not explicitly stated in the claim limitation. The claim does not mention what the font information data is used for nor does it state the user is informed. It just reads transmitting font information data to the client. Applicant further reads the specification into the claim language saying "that this informs the user of which fonts to use when creating a document to ensure that the server of capable of printing the document using the selected font." Although the claims are read in light of the specification, the specification is not read into the claim language.

With regards to Carter sending print jobs, the invention sends print jobs to the print server where the queue processor seeks to associate system and device fonts to the logical java fonts (Carter: col. 6, lines 4-18). The queue processor processes the print jobs and obtains for the fonts for the print jobs (Carter: col. 8, lines 1-28).

With regards to claims 2 and 3, applicant argues the Flowers reference does not teach the deficiencies of Carter.

The examiner maintains that Carter teaches the invention as claimed and Flowers is relied upon for transmitting operating system data between a client and server with a searching feature. Below is a statement of the relied upon teachings with motivation to combine the references.

The Flowers reference teaches a client computer further includes an operating-system transmitting unit for transmitting operating-system data, which represents an operating system of said client computer, to said server (Flowers: col. 2, lines 52-61; col. 4, lines 50-55); and

said server further includes an operating-system data receiving unit for receiving the operating-system data transmitted from said operating-system data transmitting unit of said client computer (Flowers: col. 4, lines 28-36; col. 4, lines 50-55)

a font search unit searching for fonts, on the basis of the operating system represented by the operating-system data that has been received by said operating-system data receiving unit (Flowers: col. 4, lines 50-67; col. 9, lines 41-52).

The Flowers reference further teaches it communicates with both network workstations and printers, and manages entirely the access to and the manipulation of the fonts to produce the maps and outlines in accordance with system compatibilities and formats (Flowers: col. 2, lines 43-48).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of a client and server in communication as taught by Carter while sending operating system data as taught by Flowers in order to allow access and manipulation as well as compatibility to workstations and printer (Flowers: col. 2, lines 43-48).

With regards to claims 11 and 13, applicant argues the Cedar and Yacoub references do not teach the deficiencies of Carter.

See claim limitations above for relied upon teachings and motivation to combine.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

brb